



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## II.—AFFIRMATIVE FINAL CLAUSES IN THE LATIN HISTORIANS.

The object of the present paper is to give the number of occurrences and some of the most noticeable examples of the different forms used by the Latin historians to express design. The similarity in subject-matter calls for a similar vocabulary, the variations being due to the personality of the writer which has impressed itself upon his writings. Authors in other departments of literature differ widely from the historians in the use of these forms. This is due not so much to the personal characteristics of the writer as to the department which calls for a different form of expression. For writers such as Seneca, Quintilian and Tertullian the subjunctive with *ut* is by far the most common form. Legal writers, judging by the Institutes of Gaius and of Justinian, have a decided preference for *causa* with the gerund or gerundive.

A final clause expresses an action which is distinctly considered as an 'end' by the actors in the principal statement upon which the final clause depends. Without this distinct recognition of the action as limiting the principal action there cannot be a final clause. The principal clause is primarily one expressing an action performed that the conditions may be furnished for the limiting or final action. This final action is always future to the principal action and therefore contingent. It is considered as a possible action, for man does not seek to establish conditions for the performance of what seems impossible. As the final action is contingent, the clause itself indicates nothing as to the realization of the act. However, the interpretation of the clause depends, in many instances, upon the point from which it is viewed. Such a clause may be contingent to the principal actor, but to the reader may be a realized action. *Missi sunt legati qui dicerent* is the statement of an action contingent to the person by whom they were sent; but when the context shows that they made their statement, the reader may consider *qui dicerent* as a final clause, contingent from the standpoint of the principal actor, or as a consecutive clause expressing, from his point of view, a realized action. While the reader can, by changing the point of view,

change the final to a consecutive clause, the final clause readily passes into such a clause from the standpoint of the writer himself, so that an interpretation is necessary as to which point of view was taken by him. However, to give uniformity to the discussion, all the clauses will be considered from the standpoint of the principal actor.

With the furnishing of complete conditions or means for the realization of the 'end,' the mentally realized action becomes actualized, and then we have the consecutive clause. This is complete conformity of means to an end. But the question of conformity is free from ambiguity only when we take as the starting-point the conscious purpose of the human mind. In this case that which is conformable to an 'end' is the selection or combination of means which, by their action, bring about the conditions for the realization of the 'end.' The means are of themselves not conformable to an 'end,' but are of such sort that it is possible to use them for the accomplishment of the 'end.'

The adaptation or serviceableness of things to an 'end' is of frequent occurrence, but proves nothing as to a previous action of the will. For when once there exist things with recognized properties of their own, a statement of these properties may be expressed by constructions used in the case of a personal designer. When once the grammatical form of expressing conformity becomes fixed, it may be used in statements which express, not a conformation of means to an 'end,' but only the adaptation of things to a given result. This may be due to the fact that an original will element has faded out, and there is left a certain tendency or characteristic whose grammatical expression is the same as when the original personal element was present. This can be clearly seen in the constructions which follow certain adjectives in which adaptation, and not conformation, is expressed; e. g. Tac. Ann. 3, 60, 7 *nec ullum satis validum imperium erat coercendis seditionibus populi*; 15, 67, 13 *faciendis sceleribus promptus*. Hist. 1, 9, 13 *quod saluberrimum est ad continendam militarem fidem*; 2, 99, 8 *hebes ad sustinendum laborem miles*. In none of these is there the exercise of the will for the production of conditions for the attainment of a cognized 'end,' but merely the statement of the adaptation of an unwilld condition, or characteristic of something either personal or impersonal.

As can readily be seen from the examples given, the grammatical forms readily adapt themselves to the expression of

different ideas. In the development of the expression of finality, the increasing number of forms used is due to the gradual recognition of the adaptability, for the expression of finality, of certain grammatical forms which had not at first been so used. When expressed in finite verb-form, *ut* with the subjunctive was the form developed first. But as the early language-user freely employed the accusative either with or without *ad* to express the limit of motion, accusative forms of the verb were also used to express the action which was cognized as the 'end' of the principal action. In this way came about the use of the supine and of *ad* with the accusative of the gerund or gerundive. With certain verbs the latter retained their merely terminal character, and with nouns and adjectives continued to express adaptation to an action which was not conceived as an 'end.' As the sphere of the use of the dative widened, the dative of the gerund and gerundive came to be used, especially by Tacitus, in final clauses exactly as *ad* with the accusative. These had previously been used chiefly to indicate the adaptation of nouns, and the change to the expression of finality was but an extension of this use.

In acting conformably to an end, an agent or physical means may be employed, and regarded as sufficient for the accomplishment of the final action. It is the recognized sufficiency of the employed means, whether personal or impersonal, which accounts for the use of the relatives in final clauses. *Legati venerant qui dicerent* = (*legati qui dicerent*) *venerant*, the sufficiency of the *legati* for the task being implied in the preceding action. When the relative is in an oblique case, a dative, an ablative, or an accusative with *per*, there is a transfer from a relative clause modifying a noun to a verbal expression which is considered as the sufficient means for the attainment of the end. Sallust, Ep. Mith. 4 *praebeo exemplum quo rectius tua componas*, *quo* is an ablative of means, with *exemplum* as antecedent. On the other hand, Sall. Jug. 52, 6 *aciem, quam . . . arte statuerat, quo hostium itineri officeret*, the action itself expressed by the clause *quam . . . statuerat* must be considered as the antecedent of *quo*. In clauses with both *qui* and *quo*, as has already been shown, the interpretation depends upon the point from which they are viewed, since they may be future and contingent to the principal actor, but past and realized to the reader. They may also be taken, as in the examples just given, as relative clauses showing the adaptation of an antecedent expressed by a noun or verbal expression, or as

final clauses in which the relative expresses the sufficient means for the accomplishment of the final action.

With the growth of reflection the limiting character of a future supplementary action was more clearly recognized, and with this recognition it came to be regarded as the 'end' of the preceding action. This, however, was not original with the Romans, but indicates the clearer recognition of the fitness for the Latin of a construction already used by the Greeks. While the recognition of the adaptability of the future participle to express finality is considered as a mark of Greek influence, it is to be noted that Roman writers for a long time kept aloof from it, and it is freely used only after the classical period. When the future participle is used with verbs of motion the participle is naturally taken as expressing the 'end' rather than as the mere continuation of the principal action. In *venit pugnaturus* the action expressed by the participle seems to have been distinctly cognized as the 'end' in the act of coming. The same would appear to be the case with *abscessit occisurus*, though here, as shown by the context, the killing was accidental and was not cognized as an 'end' in the departure. However, after verbs of motion the final idea generally prevails, and it may be used as coordinate with other forms expressing finality when dependent on the same verbs.

When *causa* is used with the genitive of the gerund or gerundive, the cause is the motive for the principal action, and therefore the 'end' in view.

The origin of all these is the same—the recognition of some future action as the end or limitation of the principal action. This 'end' gave rise to the motive which influenced the principal actor. Looked at in this way, the final clause expresses the end, the sufficient means, or the cause furnishing the sufficient reason for the motive influencing the actor.

In its genesis the final clause started from an original paratactic expression, out of which was developed a form of expression connected with the principal statement by a particle of uncertain origin, and used to express not only finality, but other relations as well. Looked at from the negative side, the negative particle is *ne*. Nothing, however, can be learned from this, since the negative in consecutive clauses is *non*, a compound differing from *ne* only by combination with another word. This exclusive use of *ne* with the subjunctive as the negative form seems to point to the original exclusive use of the subjunctive to express finality.

Still, in the forms not expressed by *ne* the use of the negative is precluded, for the denial of the existence of the end, the means or the cause destroys it as a motive for the principal action, for it would be the denial of the existence of that for which the preceding action took place. (For instances of *ut ne* and *quo ne*, see Draeger, II 688, 542.)

### I.—PRIMARY FORM.

#### *Ut.*

The clauses with *ut* are divided into two classes: those which express a purely contingent action, and complementary clauses—those in which an original imperative is subordinated to certain classes of verbs, especially of willing and desiring. The latter class differs from the former, since the imperative expresses not a contingent action, but one which is conceived as actually carried into effect. When these become subordinate they retain their imperative force, indicating necessary (*should*) rather than contingent action (*may* or *might*). In this expression of the obligation resting upon the subject of the subordinate clause they resemble the consecutive clauses, and at the same time are connected with the final clauses in that they express the motive (enforced) of the principal clause. The number of verbs after which *ut* is used is very large, and some of the verbs which usually have a final clause dependent on them may sometimes take a complementary clause of the second class. *Mitto* and *scribo* will illustrate this. Caes. B. G. 5, 11, 4 Labieno scribit ut . . . naves instituat. Livy 32, 38, 2 scribit ut tyrannum ipse conveniret. *Mitto* and its compounds with *nuntius* and *litterae* often have the force of a command; e. g. Caes. B. C. 1, 9, 3 litteras ad senatum miserit, ut . . . discederent; 3, 80, 3 nuntios mittit, ut . . . veniant. Livy 29, 36, 6; 30, 25, 5; 39, 11, 6.

In a few instances there is an ellipsis of the verb, e. g. Livy 2, 12, 13 'en tibi' inquit, 'ut sentias, quam vile corpus sit'; Florus 1, 10, 6 en, ut scias quem virum effugeris.

Instances in which there is a final clause dependent on a final clause are not uncommon, and need no special comment. Two final clauses dependent on the same verb are fairly common, in many instances one being affirmative while the other is negative. Livy 24, 8, 14 trium rerum causa paravimus ut . . . populareretur, ut . . . essent, ante omnia ne . . . transportaretur; 25, 15, 20; 30, 4, 11 mittit, simul ut . . . converteret, simul ne qua . . . eruptio . . .

fieret. Tac. Agr. 26, 11; Ann. 3, 65, 3; 4, 6, 19; 13, 39, 6. Just. 2, 15, 13; 14, 1, 2 indicavit, ne . . . extolleret, aut . . . terreret, simul ut . . . cognosceret. Examples are by no means uncommon in which a negated affirmative final clause is contrasted with a following clause: Livy 3, 48, 2 descendisse, non ut quemquam quietum violaret, sed ut turbantes . . . coerceret; 10, 8, 4; 25, 31, 5; 26, 41, 6 agamus, non ut ipsi maneamus in Hispania, sed ne Poeni maneant, nec ut . . . arceamus, sed ut ultro transeamus. Vell. 2, 53, 4 non ut arguerem, sed ne arguerer. Curt. 8, 8, 10 veni enim in Asiam, non ut funditus everterem gentes, nec ut solitudinem facerem, sed ut illos . . . non paeniteret. Just. 31, 5, 1; 39, 3, 5. Tac. Germ. 28, 21 ut arcerent, non ut custodirentur; Ann. (1, 12, 10;) 1, 13, 20; 13, 19, 9 non ut Africanum sibi seponeret, sed ne opibus . . . potiretur. (Amm. Marc. 26, 7, 16?) Val. Max. 9, 1 P. non quidem ut ullum honorem recipiat, sed ut . . . possit; 3, 7, Ext. 1 ut eum doceret, non ut ab eo disceret.

Different forms of expressing finality are sometimes used in the two parts: Sall. Cat. 33, 1 arma cepisse neque quo periculum aliis faceremus, sed uti corpora nostra ab iniuria tuta forent. Tac. H. 4, 5, 6 non, ut plerique, ut . . . velaret, sed quo . . . capesseret. Livy 45, 22, 14 haec non gloriandi causa rettuli, . . . sed ut admonerem. Just. P. 5 quod ad te \* \* non tam cognoscendi quam emendendi causa transmisi, simul ut et otii mei . . . apud te ratio constaret. Amm. Marc. 21, 13, 3 properare coegit, non ut lacerarent Persas in proelia, sed praetenturis iuncturos . . . ripas. Tac. H. 1, 83, 9 neque ut adfectus vestros in amore mei accenderem, neque ut animum ad virtutem cohortarer . . . sed veni postulaturus. In other passages in which there is a change of construction, the negative is not used: Sall. Or. Lep. 23. Livy 30, 16, 15 alios ad Scipionem, ut indutias facerent, alios Romam ad pacem petendam mittunt. (Just. 1, 9, 12.) Livy 1, 11, 7; 23, 26, 7 ad populandum dimisit *et* ut palantis exciperent; 44, 18, 2. Sall. Cat. 58, 3. Just. 8, 3, 8 mittit qui opinionem sererent . . . , et ut . . . sollicitarent. Tac. Ann. 13, 24, 2 quo maior species libertatis esset, utque miles . . . incorruptior ageret. Just. 25, 3, 7 speculaturus eventus . . . se recepit, ut bellum reparetur. Amm. Marc. 28, 6, 7 creavere legatos . . . primitias oblaturus, utque . . . ruinas docerent intrepide.

The formula *non modo . . . sed etiam* is sometimes used to intensify the statement of the design: Livy 34, 7, 3 nec ut vivi solum habeant, sed etiam ut cum eo crementur mortui. Tac.

Ann. 11, 24, 9 *ut non modo singuli viritim, sed terrae, gentes in nomen nostrum coalescerent.* Just. 16, 5, 11 *filium quoque suum Ceraunon vocat, ut deos non mendacio tantum, verum etiam nominibus inludat.*

In some instances the final clause is preceded by a negative, though the clause itself is still affirmative: Livy 42, 24, 9 *concessisse, non ut eriperent.* This, however, is not so common as the statements in which the negative follows *ut*, and negatives, not the clause, but a particular word in the clause: Caes. B. C. 2, 5, 5 *ut ne ad conandum quidem . . . viderent.* Livy 42, 45, 7 *ut non expectatam adhortationem esse appareret, ostenderunt.* Cf. 37, 13, 7. Curt. 7, 5, 40. Amm. Marc. 14, 11, 26 *subdidit rotam, ut universitatem regere . . . non ignoretur.* In some other passages *ut* is followed by two negatives referring to individual words: Livy 35, 25, 8 *adnisurum ut . . . nec pacis eos paeniteret, nec belli.* Curt. 4, 13, 34. Val. Max. 5, 2, 10. Just. 43, 1, 2; Amm. Marc. 24, 4, 22; 25, 3, 1. Nepos Dat. 6, 2 *ut neque circumire posset, neque impediri.* Livy 22, 12, 8 *ut neque omitteret eum, neque congregaretur;* Just. 9, 4, 3 *temperavit ut neque apud suos exultasse, neque apud victos insultasse videretur.* Clauses containing *ut* followed by *neque . . . et* are not numerous: Sall. Jug. 85, 6. Livy 1, 28, 5 *ut nec . . . averteretur . . . animus, et . . . iniceretur;* 1, 43, 10 *ut neque—et;* 1, 44, 4 *consecrabant, ut neque . . . continuarentur, . . . et extrinsecus . . . pateret;* 10, 20, 7 *consedit ut nec adventus suus . . . nosci posset, et egredientem castris hostem opprimeret.*

Successive final clauses are not infrequent, some correlative in many instances being used with *ut*: Livy 1, 43, 2 *seniores . . . ut praesto essent, iuvenes ut foris bella gererent;* 26, 39, 10; 34, 46, 11; 37, 13, 7; 38, 26, 2; 35, 26, 2 *ut experiretur, simul ut omnia . . . essent.* Bell. Af. 85, 2 *sive ut . . . sive ut.* Bell. Al. 36, 5 *observari: ut, sive amicus Domitius eas angustias transiret . . . sive inimicus ut . . . veniret.* Livy 36, 16, 10 *subsistendum . . . ut, sive victus ab consule rex esset, in expedito haberent . . . sive vinceret, ut . . . Romanos persequerentur;* 44, 8, 1 *ducit, simul ut praesidium eius firmaret, simul ut militi frumentum . . . divideret;* 44, 46, 2 *misit . . . simul ut Sinticen evastaret et ad omnes conatus regis impedimento esset;* 37, 41, 7 *eminebant falces . . . illa ut . . . abscideret, haec ut . . . contingeret.* Just. 13, 4, 9 *dividit, simul ut aemulos removeret, et munus . . . faceret.* Florus 1, 1, 12 *illi, ut et fidem solverent et ulciscerentur, clipeis obruere.* Tac. Ann. 16, 23, 9 *delectum . . . ut . . . obscuraretur, an ut . . . ostentaret.*



The following are the occurrences noticed for each of the writers examined:

Sallust,	26	Curtius,	106	Amm. Marc.,	197
Caesar,	109	Justinus,	78	Dares,	28
Nepos,	34	Tacitus,	188	Dict. Cret.,	8
Livy,	830	Suetonius,	67	Aur. Victor,	23
Velleius,	7	Florus,	32	Eutropius,	21
Val. Max.,	139	Hist. Aug.,	151		

## II.—SECONDARY FORMS.

### A. *Accusatives*.—a. *Supines*.

The supine in *-um* is a verbal noun of the fourth declension, chiefly used as a limiting accusative after verbs of motion. The most important apparent exceptions are *pessum*, *venum*, *nuptum* with *dare*, the latter also with *collocare*. There is, however, in these verbs a distinct idea of transference, and for that reason the accusative is used. Sall. Or. Macri 17 neque ego vos ultum iniurias hortor, seems to be an exception to the rule, but it is possible that *ire* has fallen from the text. If we have the statement as it was written by Sallust it must be considered as an older, freer use of the supine, or else as an indication of an effort on the part of Sallust to use the supine not as a terminal accusative, but as the object of verbs not expressing motion. The latter is probably the reason, for he seems to have adopted or extended the use of two other forms expressing finality.

The use of the supine has been discussed by Richter, *De Supinis Latinae Linguae* (5 programs), Königsberg, 1856–60; and by Draeger, H. S., II 858–66. Frequently found in early Latin, it gradually fell into disuse and was not freely used by any except archaistic writers. Of the ones examined, Sallust, Nepos, and Dictys Cretensis use it relatively most frequently. Livy has by far the largest number of occurrences, but the number per page, Teubner text, is not so large as in some of the others. Florus has but one example, *petitum*, I, 44 (3, 10), which is also used Origo Gentis Rom. (Aurelius Victor?) 20, 1, both writers evidently taking it from Livy I, 11, 6. In the case of other writers, some of the supines are due to the sources from which were derived the facts stated. Owing to this, the number of supines used by any writer is not a safe criterion of the frequency of the use of the supine in the vocabulary of the day. This is true of

all writers whose statements are derived from earlier sources. In Valerius Maximus, *questum* 4, 1, 7 occurs in the same story Livy 26, 29, 4; *petitum* 9, 6, 1: Livy 1, 11, 6; *deprecatum* 4, 7, 1: Cic. Lael. 11, 37; *sessum* 4, 5 Ext. 2: Cic. Cato Maior 18, 63. *Supplicatum* 3, 7, 1e is given in what purports to be the exact words of Scipio, 'Quirites . . . aecum est vos mecum ire in Capitolium supplicatum.' Livy 38, 51, 10 has a slightly different statement, 'Quirites, ite mecum, et orate deos.' In the De Viris Illustribus (Aurelius Victor?) 49, 16 is still another form, 'quasi bonum factum, in Capitolium eamus, et diis supplicemus.' The difference between these statements indicates either that the remarks had been handed down in different forms, or that each writer fixed them up to suit himself. Owing to the loss of the early historical sources, it is impossible to tell to what extent the supines were copied by later writers. In Sallust and Livy about one-third of the supines are in speeches or in indirect discourse. In Livy they are about equally divided between these two; in Sallust, nearly all are in the orations.

Of the writers examined, only three—Caesar, Sallust and Tacitus—have assigned to them works written at different periods. But the writing of Livy extended over such a long period of time that, in his case as well as in that of Caesar, Sallust and Tacitus, comparisons of the style at different periods can be made. In the Catiline there are three, one (c. 52, 12) in the speech assigned to Caesar. In the Jugurtha there are twenty-one, three (24, 2; 31, 27; 85, 42) in speeches, and one (109, 2) in indirect discourse. Four of the six in the fragments of the Hist. are in orations, a fact of no special significance, as the orations make up the larger part of the fragments. There is also one, *oppugnatum*, in the Invective against Cicero (2, 3) assigned by the MSS to Sallust. This increased use of the supine by Sallust is due to the archaistic tendency shown in his later works; there is also an increased number in the later works of Tacitus, due very likely to the increasing influence of Sallust. Caesar has sixteen occurrences, three of them (*pabulatum*) being in the Bell. Civ. The eighth book Bell. Gall. has three (?), while in the other works once assigned to Caesar there are ten: *Oratum* (Bell. Al. 34, 1; 67, 1) occurs three times in Caesar; *frumentatum* Bell. Af. 9, 1; 11, 3; 67, 2: B. G. 4, 32, 1; 6, 36, 2; 8, 10, 1; *aquatum* Bell. Af. 7, 5: B. G. 8, 41, 1 (?). The remainder—*deprecatum* (Bell. Hisp. 35, 1), *dormitum* (Bell. Af. 88, 3), *efflagitatum* (Bell. Af. 22, 5), and *praedatum* (Bell. Al. 10, 2)—do not occur in Caesar at all.

There are one hundred and fifty-six passages in Livy containing supines. The number for the different decades (62, 46, 34, 14) indicates a decrease in its use, due probably to the fact that in the earlier decades he followed early Roman sources more closely than he did afterwards. This is also indicated by the fact that the first decade contains fifteen out of the twenty-four supines found in indirect discourse. There are twenty used in speeches, *comisatum* occurring five times in book 40 (7, 5; 9, 11; 10, 4; 13, 2; 14, 5) in the account of the trouble between Perseus and Demetrius. Book 28, 39-41 has four supines; 7, 30-31, three. The distribution of the supines of different verbs depends on certain historical considerations at different periods. Nine out of eleven examples of the use of *exulatum* occur in the first decade. *Comisatum* occurs only in book 40. *Gratulatum* occurs ten times, six in book 45, which contains an account of the embassy of the Rhodians to the Romans.

Richter, Part II, p. 5 seqq., discusses at length the occurrences of the verbs of which other forms than the supines are used to express finality. In this respect authors differ widely. Livy has *frumentatum* nine times, *pabulatum* twelve, *lignatum* six, but does not use the gerund forms; Caesar has both. Livy has *praedatum* thirty times, the gerund forms six; Caesar only the gerund forms. Owing to the small number of supines used by most of the writers examined, comparisons with other forms employed by them are needless. As the supine was an early form, it is not used except with verbs current in the early language, and for that reason, when finality was to be expressed by verbs developed later, it was necessary to take some other form.

The following table gives the number for the different authors of passages containing supines:

Sallust,	29	Curtius,	3?	Amm. Marc.,	14
Caesar,	16	Justinus,	8	Dares Phryg.,	3
Nepos,	20	Tacitus,	12	Dict. Cret.,	33
Livy,	156	Suetonius,	4	Aur. Victor,	5
Velleius,	0	Florus,	1	Eutropius,	0
Val. Max.,	10	Hist. Aug.,	4	(Hyg. Fab.,	23)

Owing to variations in textual readings it is not possible to give the exact number for each author. A few of these variations will be given, the accepted reading being placed first. Sall. Jug. 102, 12 ob regnum tutandum: tutatum; Bell. Gall. 8, 41, 1 aquatorum:

aquaturn; Livy 22, 38, 3 ubi ad decuriatum aut centuriatum con-  
venissent: ad decuriandum aut centuriandum: decuriatum aut  
centuriatum. 42, 25, 8 legati venirent speculaturi: speculari:  
speculatum. 8, 26, 1 depopulaturum: depopulatum. 2, 48, 4  
depopulandum: depopulatum. 2, 34, 3 ad frumentum coemen-  
dum, non in Etruria modo, . . . sed [quaesitum] in Sicilia quoque.  
*Quaesitum* is bracketed by Weissenborn because of the change of  
construction with the formula *non modo . . . sed etiam*. The  
position of *quaesitum* may be compared with that of *postremo*  
32, 40, 11 non aurum modo iis, sed postremo vestem quoque.  
Cf. 38, 37, 4 non gratulatum modo venerant, sed coronas etiam  
. . . attulerant. A few instances of the coordination of the supine  
and gerund are found elsewhere: 29, 28, 10 speculatum ad mare  
turbandos egredientis ex navibus missi. 34, 62, 5 ad purganda  
crimina et questum de se Romam eos ituros comperit. Tac. Agr.  
28, 8 mox ad aquandum atque utilia raptum. This is the reading  
of Halm and Draeger, though the latter does not give this  
instance of *raptum* in the H. S., II, p. 863, nor in the Syntax u.  
Stil, §217. A similar coordination also takes place with other  
grammatical forms. Livy 1, 54, 2 praedatum atque in expedi-  
tiones. 22, 14, 4 spectatum . . . *ut* ad rem fruendam. The supine  
is also sometimes used with another form expressing design in the  
same sentence: Sall. Or. Lep. 23 nisi forte tribuniciam potestatem  
evorsum profecti sunt . . . utique iura et iudicia sibimet extor-  
querent. Nepos Milt. 1, 2 ex his delecti Delphos deliberatum  
missi sunt, qui consulerent Apollinem. Curt. 4, 10, 11 equites  
praemisit speculatum, simul ut ignem . . . extinguerent. For an  
interchange of construction with another form in successive  
clauses, see Livy 31, 42, 4 aquatum ire iubet . . . aquandi causa  
missis. Dictys Cretensis 5, 6 non civitatem vestram consideratum  
Argis venimus, verum adversum vos dimicaturi. Frequently two  
supines (e. g. Livy 2, 37, 4; 3, 25, 6; 25, 34, 4), rarely three are  
dependent on the same verb, e. g. Livy 25, 39, 8 pabulatum, lig-  
natumque et praedatum quidam dilapsi fuerant.

It will not be without interest to compare the usage of writers  
whose stylistic features are similar in other respects. Sallust was  
followed by Tacitus, and he in turn by Ammianus Marcellinus.  
Sallust has the supines of twenty-four verbs, occurring in all  
twenty-nine times, including Or. Macri 16 auctum atque adiutum  
properatis. Tacitus has twelve occurrences of six different  
supines, *raptum* (3), *illusum* and *oppugnatum* once each, not

occurring in Sallust. Tacitus has *ultum* five times; Sallust, twice. *Perditum* in Tac. once; in Sall. three times; *oratum* once in each. As the frequency of the supine in Tacitus is much less than in Sallust there is not room for extended comparisons. Amm. Marc. has *ereptum* (19, 3, 3; 22, 2, 2; 23, 6, 40; 29, 1, 18), *opitulum* (16, 12, 45; 28, 5, 2) and eight others occurring singly, including 17, 8, 5 *mittere precatum consultumque*. Five of these are found also in Sallust, but none of them in Tacitus. Curtius has but three, including 9, 1, 2 (*repletum: repleturum*), and in this respect differs widely from Livy, who uses the supine freely. This indicates that in the use of the supine at least, Curtius did not break away from the usual vocabulary of his day, in which the supine was not freely used.

b. *Ad with Accusative of Gerund and Gerundive.*

*Ad* with the accusative of the ger. is one of the most common forms, owing to the large number of verbs of motion which are used. In some instances in the case of successive clauses there is a change in form of expression and two forms are used in the same sentence: Livy 6, 28, 8 *potius ad delendam memoriam dedecoris, quam ut timorem faciat*; 23, 24, 1 *ad consules subrogandos veniret . . . ut noscere possent*; 23, 26, 7; 44, 33, 8 *non . . . ire ut armis utatur, sed ad vigilandum, ut . . . recipiat se excitetque ad arma alios*; 45, 10, 2 *ad susceptam legationem peragendam navigare Aegyptum pergit, ut . . . posset*. Suet. Jul. 4 *secedere statuit, et ad declinandam invidiam et ut . . . operam daret*. Amm. Marc. 14, 1, 6 *ad colligendos rumores . . . relaturi*; 20, 8, 19 *ad id munus implendum electi viri . . . relaturi . . . acturi*.

The formula *non modo . . . sed etiam* is sometimes used to strengthen successive clauses in which the ger. is used: Livy 21, 32, 4 *non ad tuendos tantummodo . . . sed etiam ad pellendum*; 25, 15, 18 *non ad frumenta modo . . . corrumpenda, sed ad Capuam oppugnandam*; 28, 40, 1. *Ad* with the ger. is also quite commonly used in adversative clauses introduced by *non . . . sed*. Livy 26, 8, 5 *non ad Romam obsidendam, sed ad Capuae liberandam obsidionem ire*; 35, 38, 9 *non ad oppugnandos, sed ad liberandos*. Cf. 33, 31, 9 *ad liberandam Graeciam, non ad transferendum . . . imperium*. A noun is also used as correlative with the gerund: Livy 5, 17, 1 *ad prodigii Albani procuracionem ac deos rite placandos*; 45, 3, 8 *non ad ullam aliam rem quam ad*

Perseum eripiendum. Curt. 4, 9, 13 non ad quietem sed ad praeparandos animos diebus datis. The number of occurrences noticed is as follows:

Caesar, 63	Val. Max., 117	Hist. Aug., 68
Sallust, 16	Justinus, 96	Aur. Vict., 35
Nepos, 27	Tacitus, 83	Eutropius, 13
Livy, 937	Suetonius, 91	Dares, 7
Velleius, 17	Florus, 9	Dict. Cret., 28
Curtius, 89	Amm. Marc., 141	

1. *Dative of Ger.*—In early Latin the dative of the gerund and gerundive was not freely used. See Draeger, H. S., II 598. Schwenke, Ueber das Gerundium u. Gerundivum bei Caesar und Cornelius Nepos, p. 22, gives but three examples: Caes. B. G. 3, 4, 1; 5, 27, 5; 5, 34, 2, and the latter should be a genitive. The use of the dative was extended by Livy, who uses it after a large number of adjectives and nouns, and also in place of a final clause. See Draeger, H. S., II, p. 843, where eight examples are cited. Most of them, however, are dependent on nouns showing their adaptability, or in the case of an assembly or of an officer the service to be rendered or duty to be performed, e. g. 25, 5, 2 comitia inde pontifici maximo creando sunt habita. 10, 8, 3 duoviris sacris faciundis. 10, 28, 13 luendis periculis piacula simus. Such groups made up of nouns with gerunds or gerundives were used as the objects of verbs, and in course of time the nouns came to be regarded as forming a group, not with the gerund forms, but with the verbs, and then the gerund forms were considered as expressing the end of the action, rather than the adaptation of the nouns. But as the earliest use was as modifier of the noun, it is not always possible to tell which idea was predominant in the mind of the writer, and whether the gerund form is to be considered as dependent on the noun or on the verb. Curt. 4, 2, 18 materies ratibus faciendis advehebatur; 7, 6, 13 condendae urbi sedem . . . elegerat. In both of these examples the gerundive may be taken as showing the adaptation of the noun, or the end of the action expressed by the verb together with its object, or its subject in the case of a verb in the passive voice. The same is true of many others, e. g. Suet. Titus 8 medendae valitudini leniendisque morbis . . . opem adhibuit; Nero 49 ligna conferri curando mox cadaveri. It is possible that in the course of development the same statement may have been

viewed in different ways. A gerundive which to Livy expressed the adaptation of the noun, to Tacitus might seem to express the end of the combined verbal and nominal elements. However, for the sake of uniformity, the different examples will be considered from the latter standpoint. Livy 2, 56, 2 eum vexandis . . . consulibus permissurum tribunatum; 24, 34, 7 machinamenta qua-tiendis muris portabant; 24, 40, 15 quae oppugnandae urbi comparata erant; 26, 16, 8; 27, 15, 5; 29, 20, 2 recuperandae Hispaniae delegerit ducem; 30, 12, 18; 36, 35, 4; 39, 22, 6 locum oppido condendo ceperunt. In Curtius the dat. of the gerundive is used in a few passages in which it may be taken as expressing either adaptation or finality. *Sedes* is used 7, 3, 23; 7, 6, 13; 7, 10, 15, as is *locus* in the passages last quoted from Livy. *Materies* is used the same way 4, 2, 19; 5, 3, 7; 8, 10, 30. Justinus has but one example, 2, 3, 16, XV annis pacandae Asiae inmorati.

Tacitus uses the construction more frequently than any other writer. Joerling, Ueber den Gebrauch des Gerundiums und Gerundivums bei Tacitus, pp. 11-12, gives fifty-three examples of the use of the dative in final clauses; nine similar instances are given p. 13. Helm, Quaestiones Syntacticae de Particip. Usu Tac., Vell., Sall., in discussing the dative, pp. 58-67, gives sixty-seven in which the ger. depends upon a verb. Joerling, p. 12, gives Hist. 3, 20, 14 num secures dolabrasque et cetera expugnandis urbibus attulissent as a final dative. Draeger, Syntax u. Stil, 206B. a, classifies in the same way. Heraeus, *ad loc.*, and Helm, p. 66, consider *expugnandis* as explanatory of *cetera*. Ann. 15, 4, 1 ea dum a Corbulone tuendae Syriae parantur, and 6, 37, 5 ille equum placando amni adornasset, are put by Joerling in different classes, in 6, 37 connecting the ger. with the verb. Helm also puts them in different classes, but makes the ger. in 6, 37 depend on the noun *equum*. Draeger, *ad loc.*, says, "Adornare mit dem Dativ nach Analogie von parare 15, 4." Ann. 4, 73, 6 proxima aestuaria aggeribus et pontibus traducendo graviori agmini firmat, is given by Helm and Draeger as a pure final clause. Joerling puts it into a sub-class.

The difference in classification is due to different criteria for determining finality. If direct dependence on a verb decides finality, then the list (31) given by Helm (p. 61 C.) gives the number of final datives of the ger. in Tacitus. Ann. 3, 19, 9 Drusus urbe egressus repetendis auspiciis, is certainly final. 6, 50, 20 recreandae defectioni cibum adferrent is equally so if

we consider *cibum* as forming a unit, not with the gerundive, but with the verb, and with the latter forming the conditions necessary for the fulfilment of the action expressed by the gerundive, which is considered as an end in the previous action. Looked at from this point of view the statement is but a particularized form of *recreandae defectioni agere*. Cf. 6, 43, 10 *reddendae dominationi venisse*. Interpreting the different datives of the gerund and gerundive in this way there are 75 in Tacitus which express finality. In Ammianus Marcellinus they are not of frequent occurrence. 19, 6, 1 *tempore ad quietem reficiendis corporibus dato*; 27, 10, 12; 21, 8, 1 *militibus regendis adposuit*. Aur. Victor, de Caes. 1, 6 *legatos mitterent orando foederi*. See Draeger, H. S., II, p. 845.

2. *Genitive of Gerund*.—The earliest instance of the use of the genitive of the gerund or gerundive to express finality is Terence, Adelph., 269 *vereor coram in os te laudare amplius, ne id adsentandi magis quam quo habeam gratum facere existumes*. Some change the genitive to the dative *adsentando*, but the genitive can be explained by assuming the omission of *causa*, a direct imitation of the Greek. Sallust has four similar examples: Fr. 1, 49, 8 (Kr.) *ut, omnia retinendae dominationis honesta aestumet*; Or. Phil. 3 *exercitum opprimundae libertatis habet*; 6 *arma opprimundae libertatis cepisset*; 10 *quae . . . cepit . . . legum ac libertatis subvortundae*. Constan, De Sermone Sallustiano, p. 130, admits the final force of the last example, and rejects the explanation based on the omission of *causa*. Appendix, p. 271, he calls them all genitives of quality or descriptive, and denies that there can be a final genitive of the gerund or gerundive, following Jordan (Krit. Beitr., p. 285), who thinks that these constructions arose from the old use of the gerund in which the genitive occurs joined to an attributive. That the construction was considered as an unusual one by Sallust is shown by the fact that instances of it do not occur excepting in his latest works. That they were considered as final is shown by a comparison with some other clauses similar in meaning occurring in the earlier works. Or. Phil. 10 = Cat. 33, 1 *arma . . . cepisse neque quo periculum aliis facerem, sed uti corpora nostra ab iniuria tuta forent*.

The development of the construction so far as it went was similar to that of the dative of the ger. in final clauses. At first it



was chiefly used as a modifier of a noun, and then was transferred to the expression of finality after the noun combined with a verb. The gen. of the ger. modifying a noun is not uncommon (Draeger, H. S., II 824), though there are but few examples of its use as a final clause. In a few instances the gen. may be explained as dependent on the noun, but it is better to take it as a final genitive: Caes. B. G. 4, 17, 10 si naves deiciendi operis essent a barbaris missae. Livy, 8, 6, 11 placuit averruncandae deum irae victimas caedi. 9, 45, 18 ut mitterent Romam oratores pacis petendae amicitiaeque; 36, 27, 2. 9, 9, 19 capita luendae sponsionis feramus. Draeger, H. S., II, p. 842, 'luendae sponsioni (volgo: sponsionis, was keinen Sinn giebt).'

Tacitus has nine examples in his larger works: H. (2, 100, 13 *proditiōis* or *proditiōni*); 4, 25, 12; 42, 5. Ann. 2, 59, 2; (3, 7, 2); 3, 9, 5; 27, 2; 41, 9; 6, 30, 3; 12, 24, 5; 13, 11, 8 orationibus, quas Seneca testificando, quam honesta praeciperet, vel iactandi ingenii voce principis vulgabat. Later writers seem to have avoided using the construction. Amm. Marc. 25, 5, 7 clavos regendae navis commiserunt. Aur. Victor, de Caes. 15, 4 neque ipsum ostentandi sui bellum fecisse; de Vir. Illustr. 2, 6 Tarpeiam virginem nacti, quae aquae, causa sacrorum, hauriendae descenderat. Here the omission of *causa* with the ger. is due to its use with *sacrorum*. See Draeger, H. S., II, p. 834.

### B. Relative.—a. *Qui*.

The use of the relative pronoun = *ut* with a demonstrative is common to all writers, but of most frequent occurrence in those who give accounts of the transaction of business through others chiefly by sending representatives, or using a sufficient agent or means for the performance of a given act. In the classification of relative clauses there is a difference of opinion as to the place to be assigned to some of them. This can be seen by comparing the classification in the Lex. Caes. of Menge and Preus, p. 1109, and that in Heynacher's Sprachgebrauch Caesars in Bell. Gall., p. 69. Excluding *mitto* and *praemitto*, the Lex. gives eighteen instances; Heynacher twenty-six. Two of the latter (6, 21, 1; 6, 39, 2) are classified as consecutive by the Lex., while six others are given under other divisions. As in the classification of the genitive and the dative of the gerund and gerundive, different criteria seem to be used in determining the finality of the clauses. Many relative clauses may be considered as final if we take the

principal verb and the antecedent of the relative as together forming the conditions for the final action, e. g. *Nepos, Dion 4, 1 navem ei trirerem dedit, qua Corinthum deveheretur.*

The gender of the relative, though it is usually masculine, in no way affects the finality of the clause, for the means used for the attainment of the 'end' may be of any gender. *Livy 30, 25, 4 naves mitterent, quae se prosequerentur; Caes. B. C. 2, 18, 1 frumenti magnum numerum coegit, quod Massiliensibus . . . mitteret; Tac. Ann. 2, 25, 7 missa extemplo manus, quae hostem a fronte eliceret,* in no way differ from the statements in which the relative is masculine excepting that the principal actor has used impersonal means for the accomplishment of the end in view. The relative is usually in the nominative case, though there are numerous exceptions, the principal actor using the antecedent of the relative through which he might accomplish the end. This form of statement may make the subject of the principal and subordinate verbs the same, and, by denying efficient agency to the antecedent, more clearly indicate his subordination to the principal actor. *Per* with the accusative is sometimes used: *Livy 44, 31, 9 oratores . . . mitteret . . . per quos indutias peteret. Just. 24, 1, 2. Tacitus uses it most freely of all: Agr. 14, 9 castellis promotis, per quae fama aucti officii quaereretur; H. 4, 40, 7 tum sorte ducti, per quos redderentur bello rapta; Ann. 3, 8, 2; 3, 74, 18; 16, 2, 2; 16, 24, 6 scripsisse per quae claritudinem principis extolleret. Suet. Vesp. 10 sorte elegit per quos rapta bello restituerentur. Cf. Tac. H. 4, 40, 7 supra. The dative and the ablative are used in a few instances, chiefly in Tacitus, where these cases are required by the general form of the statement, e. g. Tac. Ann. 4, 44, 7 ipse delectus, cui minor Antonia, . . . in matrimonium daretur; 6, 3, 7 discordiam . . . quaesitam, qua rudes animos . . . propelleret. 12, 22, 14 mittitur tribunus, a quo ad mortem adigeretur. Bell. Gall. 8, 7, 1 dimittit . . . ad aliquos excipiendos, ex quibus hostium consilia cognosceret. Tac. Ann. 12, 56, 10. Curt. 8, 10, 2 navigia facere, quis in ulteriora transportari posset exercitus.*

A few passages will be given in which there is a double construction dependent on the same verb: *Livy 28, 5, 16 ut posset occurrere . . . mittit qui loca alta eligerent, unde editi ignes apparent; Curt. 7, 6, 17 ad pertinaciam mitigandam . . . equites praemisit qui clementiam . . . ostenderent. Two final *qui* clauses dependent on the same verb are found. Curt. 4, 15, 6 mittit, qui*

et periculum ostenderet et, . . . consuleret. Curt. 6, 11, 7 *qui* is used in contrasted clauses, missuros ad oraculum, non qui Iovem interrogant, . . . sed qui gratias agant, qui vota . . . persolvant.

The following is the number of instances noticed in each writer:

Sallust,	10	Curtius,	49	Amm. Marc.,	9
Caesar,	57	Justinus,	35	Dares,	6
Nepos,	21	Tacitus,	98	Dict. Cret.,	3
Livy,	251	Suetonius,	25	Aur. Victor,	11
Velleius,	2	Florus,	2	Eutropius,	3
Val. Max.,	7	Hist. Aug.,	14		

b. *Quo*.

*Quo* is used referring either to a noun or an antecedent made up of verbal and nominal elements. In this the two parts coalesce as one, and to it the *quo* refers. It generally occurs with a comparative, the usage of Sallust and Tacitus being the most noticeable departure from the general rule. However, clauses in which there is a comparative do not always take *quo*, there being numerous instances in which other forms are used. Nor are all clauses final in which the comparative with *quo* is used. *Quominus* has become established as the introductory particle of a negative statement, which, from the character of the verbs with which it is used, may be considered as a negative consecutive clause, the action being regarded, not as contingent, but as actually prevented. However, the comparative *minus* is sometimes used with *quo* in final clauses, e. g. Curt. 5, 1, 40 ceterum quo minus damnum sentiret . . . renovabatur. Tac. H. 2, 89, 2 senatum et populum ante se agens, quo minus ut captam urbem ingrederetur. 4, 66, 4 quo minus ultra pergeret . . . restitit. In Sallust the comparative is not used in Cat. 11, 5; 14, 3; 38, 3; Jug. 52, 6; Hist. 1, 45, 1. Cat. 48, 4 properaret ad urbem adcedere, quo et ceterorum animos reficeret et illi facilius e periculo eriperentur. In this statement there is a comparative in one clause but not in the other, both dependent on the same verb. In one passage the verb has a comparative meaning. Jug. 37, 4 simulandi gratia, quo regi formidinem adderet. Caesar has one example, B. G. 2, 27, 2 pugnarunt, quo se legionariis militibus praeferrent. Bell. Af. 54, 3 constituunt, quo ceteri dissimiliter se gerant.

In Tacitus the comparative is omitted in nearly half the instances (38 : 43). Most of the examples, however, are in the Annals, there being two in the Agricola (18, 14; 38, 16), four in

the latter part of the Histories (3, 61, 10; 4, 14, 17; 4, 86, 11; 5, 4, 1), eight in the first part of the Annals and twenty-four in the second. This large increase for the second part of the Annals does not indicate a supplanting of *quo* without a comparative, for it occurs two-thirds as frequently in the second part as in the first (10 : 15). There was a steady growth in the construction, the number of occurrences in the Histories being one to eleven Teubner pages, in the first part of the Annals one to eight and one-half pages, in the second part one to six, the increase going chiefly to *quo* without the comparative. Suetonius has a few examples (Tib. 22). Ammianus does not use the form at all freely and generally without the comparative (19, 3, 1; 21, 3, 4; 21, 8, 3; 21, 10, 5).

That the construction both with and without the comparative was considered as equivalent to other forms can be shown by several passages in which different forms are used in successive clauses: Sall. Cat. 33, 1 *nos arma neque contra patriam cepisse neque quo periculum aliis faceremus, sed uti . . . forent*; 58, 3 *sed ego vos, quo pauca monerem, advocavi, simul uti causam mei consilii aperirem*. Nepos, Pelop. 2, 1 *Athenas se contulerunt, non quo sequerentur otium, sed ut . . . recuperare niterentur*. Florus 1, 34 [2, 19, 5] *quo melius appareant, simul et ne scelera virtutibus obstrepant*. Just. 9, 2, 10 *praemissis legatis, quo securiores faceret, qui nuntient Atheae*. Tac. H. 4, 5, 7 *ingenium . . . altioribus studiis . . . dedit, non, ut plerique, ut . . . otium velaret, sed quo firmior adversus fortuita rem p. capesseret*. Ann. 13, 9, 4 *quo bellum ex commodo pararet, an ut aemulationis suspectos . . . amoveret*. 13, 24, 1 *statio . . . demovetur, quo maior species libertatis esset, utque miles . . . incorruptior ageret*. 12, 40, 4 *aucta . . . fama quo venientem ducem exterrerent, atque illo augente audita, ut maior laus . . . tribueretur*. A good illustration of the repetition of *quo* clauses is Val. Max. 5, 1, Ext. 3 *quo tutius venirent, Lyconem Molosson obviam misit, quo honoratius exciperentur, ipse ornatu regio salutatum extra portam occurrit*.

A feature of some interest is the use of *quoque* at the beginning of a clause where *et quo* would be expected. This is not common. Draeger, H. S., II, p. 36, 2d quotes seven instances in various kinds of clauses, but only one of them final, Suet. Aug. 18 *quoque celebratior esset*. To this may be added the following: Nepos, Pelop. 4, 3; Livy 22, 3, 5; 22, 42, 2; Val. Max. 4, 7, 4; 5, 1, 11; 7, 6, Ext. 3; 9, 2, Ext. 5; 11. Curt. 8, 2, 12; Suet. Aug. 37; Cal. 16.

The number of occurrences noticed is as follows :

Sallust,	24	Curtius,	23	Amm. Marc.,	5
Caesar,	32	Justinus,	6	Dares,	0
Nepos,	18	Tacitus,	81	Dict. Cret.,	7
Livy,	78	Suetonius,	49	Aur. Victor,	2
Velleius,	4	Florus,	3	Eutropius,	2
Val. Max.,	55	Hist. Aug.,	10		

### C. Future Forms.—a. Gerundive.

The gerundive is used to express finality after certain verbs of transferring. See Draeger, H. S., II, p. 822. It is used most frequently after *curo*, but the examples of this have not been included in the summary, as it expresses an action considered by the principal actor as definitely completed, and not as contingent. It stands in the same relation to the gerundive after other verbs as the subjunctive with *quominus* stands to final clauses.

Not counting occurrences with *curo* (21), it is used by Caesar with *do* (5) and *trado* (2). Bk. VIII B. G. has *do* (1) and *suscipio* (2). In Nepos these verbs occur as follows: *do* Lys. 4, 3; *trado* Milt. 3, 2; Them. 2, 8; Dat. 4, 5; 5, 6; Eum. 2, 1; 13, 4; *suscipio* Ep. 4, 1, (*curo* 6). See Lupus, Sprachgebrauch des Cornelius Nepos, p. 187. Sallust has *do* Jug. 6, 1; *attribuo* Jug. 90, 2; *praebeo* H. 3, 61, 6. The use of the gerundive was extended by Livy, it occurring with *do* (20), *loco* (16), *trado* (9), *relinquo* (6), *divido* and *obicio* 4 each, *suscipio* (3), *attribuo* (2), and ten other verbs once each. (See partial list of Draeger, II, p. 822.) Velleius has but three occurrences, *loco* 1, 13; *relinquo* 1, 16; *suscipio* 2, 124. Curtius has five with *do* and *praebeo* (1), and *trado* (3).

Valerius Maximus and Justinus are especially free in the use of the construction. Of forty-eight instances noticed in the former, *trado* occurs 21 times, *praebeo* 7, *relinquo* 4, *do* and *obicio* 3, *loco* 2, and eight others once each. In Justinus the proportion of the verbs used is about the same. Out of eighteen instances *trado* occurs 9, *do* and *praebeo* 2, and five others once each. Tacitus has the gerundive with eight verbs, seventeen times in all. This, however, includes seven instances with *habere* which are not final. This use of the gerundive is relatively far more frequent in the Dialogus than in the works of Tacitus. See Theilmann, *Habere* mit dem Infinitive, Archiv, II 69. Later writers seem to have used the gerundive expressing finality with increasing freedom. Suetonius has seventeen verbs with twenty-

seven occurrences of the gerundive. Amm. Marc. has eighteen with the gerundive, fourteen once each; *trado* 3, *committo*, *do*, and *mitto* 5 each. The Script. Hist. Aug. have thirty-one occurrences with sixteen verbs, *do* occurring 11 times, *accipio* 4. Florus has nine instances, Dict. Cret. eight, Aur. Vict. (?) twelve with six verbs, Eutropius three. (In the Institutes of Gaius and Justinian either *accipio* or *do* is used in twenty-four out of thirty occurrences.)

#### b. *Future Participle.*

The use of the future participle is the result of considering a continuative action as the end or limitation of the principal action. This is especially true after verbs of motion, as has been shown, but even then the participle is not always final. Quintilian 9, 3, 12 criticises Sallust for his use of the future participle, unde eousque processum est ut . . . visuros (pro) ad videndum missos idem auctor dixerit. Donatus ad Terence Hec. 5, 1, 33 also quotes from Sallust, graviore bello qui prohiberi venerant socii, fringere. Macrobius 1, 16, 33 quotes from an earlier writer, Cassius, Servium Tullium fecisse nundinas dicit, ut in urbem ex agris convenirent urbanas rusticasque res ordinaturi. If the entire statement is an exact quotation it indicates an early use of the future participle to express finality, but the participle is very likely due to Macrobius himself. In the Bell. Af. there is one instance of this use of the participle, 25, 4 dum alios adiuturus proficisceretur. The use of the participle was extended by Livy, and continued by later writers who employed the future more and more as the use of the supine declined. The development for a time seems to have been tentative, as is indicated by the occurrence with the participle of several particles indicating that the participles gave merely the ostensible motive for the principal action. The particles so used are *quasi*, *tamquam*, *ut* and *velut*. The following are the occurrences for each, in statements of apparent design:

*Quasi.* This particle is found most commonly in late writers, most frequently in Suetonius. Curt. 10, 5, 15. Just. 27, 3, 1; 22, 2, 10; 29, 2, 8 pacem fecit, non quasi alio bellum translaturus, sed ut Graeciae quieti consulturus. Tac. Ann. 2, 63, 15; 15, 10, 9 duxit legiones quasi proelio certaturus. 15, 72, 4. Suet. Jul. Caes. 82 (twice), Tib. 39; 70; 73; Cal. (34); 46; Nero (40); 47; Galba 9; 10; Otho 7; Vit. 15; 17. Amm. Marc. 26, 4, 1; 7, 5; 29, 2, 14; (31, 12, 9). Eutrop. 7, 2, 1.

*Tamquam.* Livy 21, 61, 1 tamquam occursurus . . . iter ad

mare convertit; 37, 23, 6; 40, 4, 10; 44, 9, 10; Val. Max. 9, 6, 2; 9, 12, Ext. 10 restitit tamquam . . . sustenturus. Dial. de Orat. 2, 15 contemnebat tamquam . . . habiturus. Tac. (H. 4, 19, 15); Ann. 6, 36, 4; 12, 49, 5; 14, 33, 17.

*Ut.* Livy 7, 23, 6 ut . . . initura, explicuisset aciem; 21, 32, 10 subiit tumulos ut . . . facturus. 28, 26, 12; 31, 42, 5; 35, 50, 11; (42, 63, 5). Val. Max. 5, 9, 2. Tac. Ann. 1, 47, 11; H. 2, 58, 10; 2, 80, 4; 3, 68, 17. Amm. Marc. 26, 8, 14; 29, 6, 5.

*Velut.* Livy 30, 4, 10; 44, 35, 14; 44, 35, 23 degressus . . . veluti . . . temptaturus. Val. Max. 4, 6, Ext. 3; 7, 3, 3; 8, 11, 7. Curt. 9, 7, 19. Just. 5, 10, 9; 22, 2, 10; 33, 2, 2. Tac. Ann. 4, 69, 8 velut recens cognita narraturus, . . . trahit.

The number of occurrences in final clauses is as follows:

Livy,	31	Tac.,	14	Dares,	1
Velleius,	4	Suet.,	10	Dict. Cret.,	2
Val. Max.,	10	Florus,	2	Aur. Victor,	1
Curt.,	52	Hist. Aug.,	31	Eutropius,	1
Just.,	30	Amm. Marc.,	150		

In Livy the number is least for the first decade (6, 10, 8, 7), which may perhaps be due to the fact that in the later decades he was influenced by the Greek authors consulted in writing of the war with Hannibal and the war in Greece. Val. Max. has but few examples, some of which may be due to the sources followed, although in a few instances, a comparison with Livy shows a stronger tendency to use the participle. Livy 1, 54, 5 ex suis unum sciscitatum Romam ad patrem mittit quidnam se facere vellet: Val. Max. 7, 4, 2 familiarem misit . . . quaesitum quidnam fieri vellet. Livy 1, 45, 6 bovem Romam actam deducit ad fanum Dianae et ante aram statuit: Val. Max. 7, 3, 1 bovem . . . actam in Aventino ante aram Dianae constituit . . . daturus. Livy 27, 40, 9 M. Livium ad bellum proficiscentem monenti Q. Fabio: Val. Max. 9, 3, 1 cum adversus Hasdrubalem Livius Salinator bellum gesturus urbe egrederetur, monente Fabio Maximo. The construction is found frequently in Curtius, Justinus and Amm. Marc., in whose work it is one of the most common forms expressing finality.

The verbs with which the future participle is used are chiefly verbs of motion, so that it covers about the same field as the supine, though the use is a little more extended. Sall. Or. Macri 16 auctum atque adiutum properatis, is the only passage in which *propero* is used with the supine, though Amm. Marc. has it with

the participle 15, 5, 7; 25, 8, 9; 26, 8, 3. *Adiutum* is also used by Nepos, and in a quotation by Gellius 14, 6, 1; Amm. Marc. has *iuvaturus* 14, 6, 17; 20, 4, 8. As an indication of the shifting from the supine to the future participle will be given a list of early supines which occur as participles in Ammianus, the figures after the colon being the references to that writer. Of course there was no definite time at which the change from the supine to participle was consciously made, but the comparison will show something of the general drift. *cognitum* Sall.: 23, 2, 2; 27, 5, 1. *nunciatum* Sall., Livy: 16, 12, 19; 25, 8, 7. *oratum* Caes., Sall., Livy: 21, 15, 4; 28, 1, 24; 29, 5, 15; 31, 12, 12. *hiematum*: 16, 3, 3; 20, 10, 3; 20, 11, 32. *petitum*, common in early writers: 14, 10, 9; 19, 8, 9; 22, 16, 11; 24, 4, 8; 27, 8, 2. *precatum* Livy: 17, 8, 5; 18, 2, 15. *spectatum* Livy, Val. Max.: 20, 2, 2; 31, 3, 5. *visum* Sall.: 28, 4, 18; 29, 3, 9. *venatum* Nepos, Livy, Suet.: 28, 4, 18. Some also appear as participles in Justinus. *speculatum* common earlier: 18, 2, 4; 25, 3, 7. *consultum* Nepos, Livy: 3, 3, 11; 11, 11, 2. *sciscitatum* common in accounts of religious embassies: 14, 6, 6. Some other participles also appear in Tacitus and Suet., and in some of the works both supine and participle forms of the same verb are found.

The participle did not take the place of the supine only, for in some instances it seems to have displaced *causa* or *gratia* with the genitive of the gerund or gerundive. *hiemandi* g. Sall. J. 61, 2; Caes. B. C. 1, 37, 1; Tac. Hist. 4, 3, 5; Amm. Marc. participle three times. *occidendi* gr. Val. Max. 9, 4, 2; Curt. 9, 7, 6. *indicandorum* c. Val. Max. 3, 3, Ext. 3; Curt. 6, 11, 19 *indicaturus*. Sall. J. 61, 4 *conloquendi* gr.: Val. Max. 4, 6, Ext. 3 *allocuturus*.

In a few instances there is a double construction dependent on the same verb, which shows that the construction was considered as the equivalent of the other forms. Livy 35, 29, 10 *progredi*, ut intercluderent iter . . . simul etiam temptaturos. Tac. Ann. 14, 8, 18 si ad visendum venisset, . . . sin facinus patraturus. 14, 41, 4 reos, ne apud praefectum urbis arguerentur, ad praetorem detulisset, . . . ultionem elusurus. Amm. Marc. 16, 11, 13 Iulianus non levaturus incommoda Galliarum electus est, sed ut possit per bella deleri; 17, 13, 5 *venere fluminis ripam*, ut exitus docuit, non iussa facturi, sed ne viderentur militis praesentiam formidasse; Dict. Cret. 1, 11 *contestandi magis gratia quam aliquid ex oratione profecturus cuncta* . . . *retexuit*. With these may also be placed Just. 1, 10, 14 *recepit*, . . . *regnum firmaturus*, ut . . .



videretur. 9, 1, 9 praedandi causa profectus est, . . . inpenas belli refecturus. The full equivalence may also be shown by some separate passages from Livy: 41, 22, 5 oraculum aditurus Delphos escendit; 41, 23, 14 ut . . . conspiceretur, Delphos escendit; 42, 15, 4 satis constabat Eumenem, ut sacrificaret Apollini, Delphos escensurum; 42, 42, 2 sacrificandi causa . . . Delphos escendi.

In a few instances there are two participles dependent on the same verb, e. g. Just. 7, 3, 5 evocat, cultius exornaturus gratiorumque reducturus. Amm. Marc. 20, 8, 19 electi . . . relaturi . . . acturi; 28, 4, 18 visuri processerunt aut . . . venaturi.

#### D. Causal.—Causa or Gratia with Genitive of Ger.

*Causa* is much more frequently used with the genitive of the ger. than is *gratia*, though the latter is the predominant form used by a few writers.

The following is the number noticed for the different authors examined:

	Causa.	Gratia.		Causa.	Gratia.
Sallust,	4	9	Suetonius,	15	7
Caesar,	85	2	Hist. Aug.,	8	5
Nepos,	1	5	Amm. Marc.,	14	8
Livy,	112	3	Florus,	0	0
Velleius,	2	3	Aur. Victor,	0	9
Val. Max.,	8	26	Eutropius,	1	0
Curtius,	0	0	Dict. Cret.,	3	3
Justinus,	3	2	Gaius (Inst.)	18	10
Tacitus,	5	2	Just. " "	18	13

In Sallust, two of the occurrences of *causa* are in the Catiline, while all the examples of *gratia* are in the Jugurtha. This indicates an increasing fondness for the word on the part of Sallust. Of the other writers, Nepos, Valerius Maximus, Aurelius Victor, and the legal writers are the only ones in which the use of *gratia* is noticeable. In Caesar, *gratia* is used B. C. 2, 7, 3 nuntii perferendi gratia; B. G. 7, 43, 2 legatos ad Caesarem, sui purgandi gratia mittunt. Haec faciunt recipiendorum suorum causa. Here the use of *gratia* is evidently due to *causa* in the following clause. Livy has three examples, 6, 31, 2; 7, 3, 9; 22, 59, 7, the last being in a speech. A slight indication of individual preference may be seen by comparing the accounts given by Livy and by Val. Max. of the unfortunate professor of the Falisci. Livy 5, 27, 2

has lusus exercendique causa producere . . . ad Camillum perduxit. Val. Max. 6, 5, 1 pueros velut ambulandi gratia eductos in castra Romanorum perduxit.

Both words may be used with either verbal or nominal elements, so that we may have, after each, an expression calling attention either to the attainment of an object, or to the object obtained, e. g. *frumentandi causa* B. C. 1, 48, 7; B. G. 4, 9, 3; 4, 12, 1; 4, 16, 2: *rei frumentariae causa* in six passages; *frumenti c.* in two. Livy 9, 34, 12 quem clavi fingendi aut ludorum causa dictatorem audacter crees. As a still better example of change in form of expression may be given Suet. Jul. Caes. 30 (Cic. de Off. 3, 21, 82):

Nam si violandum ius, regnandi gratia,  
Violandum est: aliis rebus pietatem colas.

This is a translation of Euripides, Phoen. 534-535:

εἴπερ γὰρ ἀδικεῖν χρῆ, τυραννίδος πέρι  
κάλλιστον ἀδικεῖν, τᾶλλα δ' εὐσεβεῖν χρεών,

*regnandi gratia* taking the place of a noun dependent on a preposition.

Instead of the ablative, *per causam* may be used without any apparent difference of meaning. Caes. B. C. 3, 24, 1 *per causam* exercendorum remigum ad fauces portus prodire iussit. 3, 76, 1 equitatum *per causam* pabulandi emissum. B. G. 7, 9, 1 *per causam* supplementi equitatusque cogendi ab exercitu discedit. Bell. Af. 73, 3 *per causam* frumentandi. Livy 22, 61, 8. Suet. Caes. 2.

A few examples will be quoted in which *causa* or *gratia* is used in successive contrasted clauses. Livy 36, 9, 4 non belli faciendi sed tuendae et stabiliendae libertatis Thessalorum causa. Amm. Marc. 28, 1, 4 non consolandi gratia, sed probrose monendi. Slightly different from these are the passages in which the formula *non modo* is used. Livy 4, 21, 6 non modo praedandi causa, . . . sed . . . populabundi descenderent. 28, 38, 8 non suffragandi modo, sed etiam spectandi causa P. Scipionis.

In some passages the construction with *causa* is coordinate with another form, e. g. Livy 1, 11, 7 necavere, seu ut vi capta potius arx videretur, seu prodendi exempli causa. 45, 22, 14 haec non gloriandi causa rettuli . . . sed ut admonerem. Amm. Marc. 22, 8, 47 constat . . . pariendi gratia, petere pisces, ut salubrius fetus educant.

The construction is active throughout, excepting Just. 17, 3, 11 Athenas quoque erudiendi gratia missus. Here the gerund with *gratia*, as in the quotation from Euripides already given, may be a translation of a Greek noun and preposition not indicating voice at all. Cf. Archiv, I 169 seqq. for a discussion of the use of *causa* and *gratia*.

### III.—DIFFERENT WORKS COMPARED.

The indications of personality in the use of the different forms used to express design make the investigation of some importance as a test of the question of authorship. While they are not absolutely conclusive as to authorship, still they are of value in a complete statement of stylistic similarities and divergences obtained by a comparison of different works. The most noticeable features in the works of Sallust occur in his latest productions, as is also the case with Tacitus. In the Oratio and Epistula ad Caes. Senem, and the Inv. in Tullium, *ut* is by far the most common form used, though the supine occurs Inv. 2, 3 domum tuam oppugnatum venerat. However, the pieces are so short and the subject-matter so different from that in the works of Sallust that there is not a sufficient basis for extended comparisons. It is different in the case of the works which have been assigned to Caesar. Each of these has a considerable number of examples, and at a few points there are indications of decided preferences in the choice of forms. The following table gives the number of occurrences for the different works:

#### A. Caesar.

	Caes.	Bk. VIII. B. G.	Bell. Al.	Bell. Af.	Bell. Hisp.
ad,	63	22	29	14	21
ut,	109	7	16	25	9
qui,	57	10	3	3	2
quo,	32	6	4	9	1
causa,	85	4	8	1	0
gratia,	2	1		12	
supine,	16	2	3	6	1
gerundive,	7	2	3	3	1
fut. part.,				1	

The Bell. Af. is characterized by a more extended use of *ut* than of *ad*, the use of *gratia* instead of *causa*, of the fut. part. and of the supine more commonly than the other works. The absence of both *causa* and *gratia* from the Bell. Hisp. is noticeable. The Bell. Al. and Book VIII B. G. do not materially differ,

and are very much like the genuine works of Caesar except in the proportion of *ad* and *ut*.

### B. *Script. Hist. Aug.*

In the works of the six *Scriptores Hist. Aug.*, 298 occurrences were noticed. The subject-matter is about the same in all, though the number per page, Teubner text, varies from .71 in Spartian to .44 in Treb. Poll. and Vopiscus. The following table gives the number of occurrences for each of the writers:

	Capitol.	Spartian.	Lamprid.	Vopiscus.	Treb. Poll.	Vulc. Gall.	
<i>ut</i> ,	46	20	39	23	16	7	151
<i>ad</i> ,	15	25	14	8	6		68
<i>qui</i> ,	1	8	2	2	1		14
<i>quo</i> ,	5	2	1	2			10
<i>causa</i> ,	2	1	2	1	2		8
<i>gratia</i> ,	2	2			1		5
<i>supine</i> ,	1		2	1			4
<i>fut. part.</i> ,	1		1	2	3		7
<i>gerundive</i> ,	14	8	1	4	4		31
	<hr/> 87	<hr/> 66	<hr/> 62	<hr/> 43	<hr/> 33	<hr/> 7	<hr/> 298

*Ut* clauses form about half of the occurrences except in Spartian, where they are less than one-third, while he uses *ad* more freely than do the other writers. Slight differences are also noticeable in the use of *causa* and *gratia*. Excluding Vulc. Gall., whose work is very limited, all but one have the *fut. part.*, while two do not use the *supine*. The *gerundive* is freely used by all excepting Lampridius, it being most noticeable in the works of Capitolinus.

### C. *Aurelius Victor.*

The following table gives the number of occurrences for the different works passing under the name of Aurelius Victor:

	Origo Gent.	De Vir. Ill.	De Caess.	Epit.	
<i>ad</i> ,	5	11	12	7	35
<i>ut</i> ,	4	15	2	2	23
<i>qui</i> ,	3	6	1	1	11
<i>quo</i> ,	2	0	0	0	2
<i>supine</i> ,	3	0	2		5
<i>gratia</i> ,	5	2	2	0	9
<i>fut. part.</i> ,	0	0	1	0	1
<i>gerundive</i> ,	4	6	0	2	12
	<hr/> 26	<hr/> 40	<hr/> 20	<hr/> 12	<hr/> 98

The use of *gratia* is common to all. The supine is found in but two, and is very likely due to the sources followed. The future part. expressing finality occurs but once, de Caess. 6, 3. The *gerundive* is not used in the de Caess. The last two of the works seem to be more nearly related to each other than to the first two, though this may be due to the utilization of common sources. The de Vir. Ill. and the Origo Gent. are akin in subject-matter and have about the same relative number of each form as might be expected, though there is a noticeable difference in the use of *quo* and the supine, and considerable difference in the use of *gratia* and of *ut*.

#### IV.—SUMMARY.

The final table gives the number of occurrences for each of the writers, and also the per cent. of occurrences for each of the forms used to express finality. Owing to the mass of examples in Livy the average per cent. does not vary far from his, the widest divergence being in the case of *ad*. In some of the writers a low per cent. for one form is balanced by a high per cent. for another. This is the case with *ad* and *causa* in Caesar, *ad* and the *supine* in Sallust, *ad* and *ut* in Velleius, *ad* and the gen. and dat. of the ger. in Tacitus, and *ut* and *quo* in Tacitus. However, in the last seven on the list, a high per cent. of one form is balanced by a low per cent. for a number of the others. Some of the most marked deviations from the general average are to be found in the writers in which there are comparatively few occurrences. Rejecting half a dozen in which there are the fewest occurrences, in the remainder, the difference between the highest and the lowest per cent. is about .300 for *ut*, .250 for *ad*, .155 for *qui*, and .180 for *quo*. *Causa* with the ger. is not used by Curtius and Florus to express design, though the former has the nom. with the ger. 6, 11, 32; 7, 1, 39. After the time of Livy, the per cent. for the supine in the most important writers does not rise above .03, though Dict. Cret., one of the minor writers, has the largest per cent. of them all. The per cent. for *quo*, *causa*, supine, fut. part. and gerundive is nearly the same, yet more than four-fifths of the participles are to be found in four writers, and nearly one-half of them in one, Ammianus Marcellinus, though they occur in all but Caesar and Nepos. Attention has already been called to the usage of the different writers with reference to *causa* and *gratia* and of *quo* without a comparative. The examples given under each section

indicate the practical equivalence of the different forms, and variations from the general average can be well explained by differ-

	ut.	ad.	qui.	quo.	causa.	Supine.	Fut. Part.	Gerundive.	Dat. Ger.	Gen. Ger.	
Caesar,	109	63	57	32	87	16	—	7		1	372
Sallust,	26	16	10	24	13	29	3	3		4	128
Nepos,	34	27	21	18	6	20	—	8			134
Livy,	830	937	251	78	115	156	31	73	9	4	2484
Velleius,	7	17	2	4	5	—	4	3			42
Curtius,	106	89	49	23	—	3	52	5	6		333
Val. Max.,	139	117	7	55	34	10	10	42			414
Justinus,	78	96	35	6	5	8	30	18	1		277
Tacitus,	188	83	98	81	7	12	14	10	75	9	577
Suetonius,	67	91	25	49	22	4	10	27	5		300
Florus,	32	9	2	3	—	1	2	9			58
Amm. Marc.,	197	141	9	5	22	14	150	32	3		573
Hist. Aug.	151	68	14	10	13	4	7	31			298
Aur. Vict.,	23	35	11	2	9	5	1	12	1	2	101
Eutropius,	21	13	3	2	1	—	1	3			44
Dares,	28	7	6	—	—	3	1	1			46
Dict. Cret.,	8	28	3	7	6	33	2	8			95
Totals,	2044	1837	603	399	345	318	318	292	100	20	6276

	ut.	ad.	qui.	quo.	causa.	Supine.	Fut. Part.	Gerundive.	Dat. Ger.	Gen. Ger.	
Caesar,	.293	.169	.153	.086	.234	.043		.019		.003	
Sallust,	.203	.125	.079	.188	.101	.227	.023	.023		.031	
Nepos,	.254	.201	.157	.134	.044	.149		.060			
Livy,	.334	.377	.101	.031	.046	.063	.013	.029	.004	.002	
Velleius,	.167	.405	.047	.096	.119	—	.096	.070			
Curtius,	.319	.268	.148	.069	—	.009	.154	.014	.018	—	
Val. Max.,	.336	.273	.015	.133	.080	.024	.024	.102			
Justinus,	.281	.347	.125	.022	.018	.029	.107	.066	.004		
Tacitus,	.326	.144	.170	.140	.012	.021	.022	.018	.130	.016	
Suetonius,	.223	.304	.083	.163	.073	.014	.033	.090	.017		
Florus,	.551	.155	.034	.051		.018	.035	.155			
Amm. Marc.,	.344	.246	.016	.008	.039	.024	.262	.056	.005		
Hist. Aug.,	.507	.228	.047	.033	.043	.014	.023	.104			
Aur. Vict.,	.228	.347	.109	.019	.089	.049	.010	.118	.010	.020	
Eutropius,	.477	.295	.068	.045	.023		.023	.068			
Dares,	.609	.152	.130			.065	.022	.022			
Dict. Cret.,	.084	.294	.031	.074	.063	.347	.021	.084			
Average,	.3258	.2928	.0961	.0636	.0555	.0507	.0507	.0465	.0160	.0031	

ences in subject-matter calling for the use of different verbs by the individual writers.

Of the writers examined, Sallust certainly shows the greatest freedom, especially in his later works. Instances of *quo* without a comparative, of the genitive of the ger. without *causa*, and of the future participle expressing design, are also rather common in Tacitus, but they appear in his works as the result of the influence of Sallust, and his only noticeable variation from other writers is his use of the dative of the gerund and gerundive, of which only a comparatively few examples occur in other writers. Some of the writers examined are so dependent on earlier sources that the usage of each is really the reflection of the usage of many writers, and the results are not really assignable to a single writer. The later writers show but few points of interest, the most interesting one being Dictys Cretensis, noticeable for his archaistic use of the supine, and of *gratia* instead of *causa*.

ILL. WESLEYAN UNIV., BLOOMINGTON, ILL.

R. B. STEELE.